

Food is more tasteful, healthful and nutritious when raised with

ROYAL BAKING POWDER



The only baking powder made from Royal Grape Cream of Tartar

Made from Grapes

Absolutely PURE

PAT CROWE, REFORMED TO BE AN EVANGELIST

Through With the Old Game, Wants to Keep the Young Men Straight.

Chicago, Dec. 9.—Pat Crowe, once under charge of kidnapping "Eddie" Cuddey, and one of the most picturesque characters with whom the police of the country have had to deal in the last 15 years, has forsaken the old life and accepted Christianity.

As soon as he can complete his plans, he will go forth as an evangelist. He was found at work here on the manuscript of a sermon.

"I'm through with the old game for good and all," said Crowe. "I have cut out the drinking and have become a Christian."

"Now I'm going out regularly to put the young fellows on the right track and warn them from the paths and temptations that no one knows better than I do. I am not going to be a temperance lecturer. I am going into a broader field."

Those who know Crowe say they believe him. They are sure, they declare, that he means to keep his word and that the underworld sees him again it will be when he appears as a missionary to win his former companions to the church. Crowe is married and has a son, Pat Crowe, Jr., one year of age. The family lives in a little flat at 2323 Dearborn street. Tears glistened in Mrs. Crowe's eyes when asked concerning the report that her husband had reformed.

"Yes, it is true, and I am so glad, for my sake and the baby's," she exclaimed. "I don't know just how it happened, but I know it is true. Some kind people talked to him, and now I have no further fear. We are so happy in our little home. You see, it costs some money to live in a flat, and so we thought we would do a little saving. We moved here recently and I have not yet arranged everything."

"Mr. Crowe is intending to give a series of lectures in Evanston and in various missions throughout the state. I am sure he will do much good."

Hard to Understand.

Bacon.—That's the third time this week I've seen him coming out of that X-ray doctor's.

Egbert.—Is that so? What in the world do you suppose the doctor can see in that man?—Yonkers Statesman.

"BLUES"? Something's Wrong Inside

Indigestion, Biliousness, Constipation

The "blues" come more often from the stomach than from the mind.

We feel "blue," "down in the mouth," and discouraged when the stomach is upset, because the stomach nerves affect the head, and it is hard to be cheerful when the stomach is sick.

When you have the "blues" take

Beecham's Pills

and in a short time they will make a world of difference in your spirits, your feelings and your digestion.

The good effects of Beecham's Pills are first felt in the stomach, then they act on the bowels, carry off the bile, and soon you are feeling fit, well and strong.

Beecham's Pills are world-famous, and the best thing to take to be rid of the "blues," and to

Keep Stomach, Bowels and Bile in Good Order

In Boxes with full directions, 10c. and 25c.

MAPLE SYRUP AND SYRUP

We have a quantity of extra nice pure Maple Syrup and Sugar which we are selling at very reasonable prices.

L. B. Dodge,

WORTHEN BLOCK,

KEITH AVENUE.

MYSTERY IN DEATH

Prominent St. Louis Man Shot and Killed Under

STRANGE CIRCUMSTANCES

The Police Are Puzzled—Francis D. Hirschberg, a Victim in a Most Unusual Real Life Tragedy.

St. Louis, Dec. 9.—Francis D. Hirschberg, prominent in the Roman Catholic church and a personal friend of Archbishop Glennon, also well known in club and business circles and as a doctor of the Louisiana purchase exposition, was shot and killed at his home, 3,318 Lindell boulevard, early yesterday. Whether his death was the result of murder or suicide has not been determined.

A trail of blood stains on the stairway from the reception hall on the first floor indicate that Mr. Hirschberg was shot at the foot of the stairs and then turned and walked back to his bed room on the second floor. From there he crossed a hallway and hurried through his wife's room to the bathroom. He returned and staggered into his wife's room. Mrs. Hirschberg says she awoke just in time to see him sink to the floor unconscious.

Mrs. Hirschberg had her husband carried to his bedroom and he died soon afterward without making a statement as to how he was shot. As far as the police can learn, no member of the household was on the lower floor at the time of the shooting. Mrs. Hirschberg is deaf and therefore she did not hear the report of the revolver.

It was largely through the instrumentality of Mr. Hirschberg that the site for the archiepiscopal residence adjoining the Hirschberg home was purchased. He was Archbishop Glennon's closest personal friend among the laity.

A descendant of the Chauvin, Papin and Choctau families and having for wife a daughter of the late General D. M. Frost, the social position of Mr. Hirschberg was high. He was a son of Madame Lucille Hirschberg, who before her marriage was Miss Lucille Chauvin, a member of one of the oldest and most exclusive French families of the city. Mrs. Hirschberg is a sister of Lady Nobleworth, wife of an English peer. There are no children.

He was 54 years of age and for many years had been a leader in the insurance business.

He was the first to introduce in America the system of insuring employers against accidents to their workmen. He was one of the organizers of the St. Louis "Underwriters' association," which later was succeeded by the present organization, the Fire Prevention bureau of the city. He was chairman of the committee that had charge of the entertainment of all the distinguished guests who came to St. Louis at the time of the World's fair.

The Hirschberg tragedy, following so closely upon the suicide Monday of Chas. A. Eckstromer, Swedish vice-consul, and Charles W. Blow, a prominent business and club man, both of whom were friends of Mr. Hirschberg, has caused a sensation.

The police found several baffling features. The blood stains on the stairway indicated that Mr. Hirschberg stood on the third step from the bottom when he was shot. Immediately below him there was an empty chair which leaves a dent as though it had been struck by the revolver which was found beside it. The weapon was of a type used 30 years ago. Members of the family said that they had never seen it before. The bullet which caused the death was not found. The possibility of financial troubles was scouted by intimates of the dead man, although some of his casual acquaintances say that he had been complaining that "business was not what it should be."

A minute search of the premises by the police failed to reveal any signs of the entrance of an intruder.

HAINS CASE COMES UP MONDAY.

Motion to Set Aside Special Panel of Jurors Denied.

New York, Dec. 9.—T. Jenkins Hains, in the custody of under sheriff Phillips, appeared before Justice Crane in the supreme court at Flushing, on Monday morning, while his counsel, Eugene N. L. Young, argued a motion to set aside the special panel of jurors drawn last week. Judge Crane refused to grant the motion to dismiss the special panel and said that this was not the time to make a motion of that sort. He set the case for trial on Monday, December 14, at one o'clock, and said that if the occasion showed the need of more jurors, counsel could then call of special panel of one hundred and fifty.

Washington, Dec. 9.—Captain Peter C. Hains, Jr., of the Forty-eighth company, Coast Artillery, at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N. J., who is under arrest, charged with the murder of W. E. Annis, has been transferred on recommendation of the chief of the artillery corps to the Sixty-second company of the Coast Artillery, which is stationed at Fort Worden, Port Townsend, Wash. The order will be effective Feb. 1, 1909. It was stated at the war department that Captain Hains' transfer is merely a "paper assignment" and will not interfere with his trial in New York.

PORTLAND, ORE., BANK ROBBERY.

Three Masked Men Got Away With \$16,500.

Portland, Ore., Dec. 9.—The East Side bank was robbed Monday night by three masked men, of \$16,500. The president of the bank, Henry H. Newhall, and his son, Roger, were just about to leave the bank for home when two men armed with pistols entered. President Newhall and his son were ordered to hold up their hands, and while they were thus under the cover of one robber's revolver, the other man crawled through the cashier's window, passed out the money and then crawled back into the foyer. A third robber guarded the entrance. The three men escaped.

CANAL INQUIRY IS UNLIKELY

Questioning France a Difficult Matter

MIGHT MAKE AWKWARD

International Situation—Matter Discussed by Democrats, However—Charges Made by the New York World Reiterated.

Washington, Dec. 9.—Democratic senators are conferring busily as to the advisability of asking for a congressional investigation of the distribution of the \$40,000,000 paid, according to President Roosevelt, by the United States government to the French government for the assets of the old French company which began the Panama canal. The publication of the New York World's editorial defense of its original charges, bristling with the sworn testimony of William Nelson Cromwell relative to the settlement, has laid a stratum of apparent fact under the controversy, and this in the opinion of influential Democratic senators is sufficient to warrant official investigation. The difficulty found is that such an investigation would necessitate inquiries of the French government, which could not be made without creating an awkward international situation.

CHARLES TAFT MAKES REPLY.

In His Newspaper, He Has a Few Things to Say to the New York World.

Cincinnati, O., Dec. 9.—The Cincinnati Times Examiner, of which Charles P. Taft is editor and proprietor, published yesterday the following reply to the article on the Panama canal which appeared in the Indianapolis News and New York World.

"The New York World, the paper which was responsible for most of the talk about the Panama scandal during the recent campaign, says this morning:

"Whether Douglas Robinson, who is Mr. Roosevelt's brother-in-law, or any of Mr. Taft's brothers associated themselves with Mr. Cromwell in Panama exploitation or shared in these profits is incidental to the main issue of letting in the light."

"This statement is intentionally misleading. The Panama story was used in the campaign for political reasons solely. The one thing that gave it political value in the eyes of those who used it, was the fact that the story, as plotted, carried the name of a brother of the Republican candidate for the presidency, and of a brother-in-law of the president."

"Interference was plain enough. It was that Theodore Roosevelt and William H. Taft had used their influence as high officials of the United States government to help near relatives in looting the treasury at Washington. That was the meat of the story. If the names of Douglas Robinson and Charles P. Taft had not been included in it, slimsy and absurd as it was, the lying yarn would never have been used by the World, and Indianapolis News and other papers which for one reason or another wanted to defeat Mr. Taft and discredit Mr. Roosevelt."

"The World is trying to dodge the issue. It wants to be relieved of the responsibility of trying to drag the names of Mr. Robinson and Mr. Taft into its made-to-order mess of scandal and slime."

"Both The World and the Indianapolis News are crying, 'Let in the light.' We thoroughly agree with them. But after a little time has passed, after the most desperate efforts of the cornered World and News have produced all the evidence they may, an apology will be in order from these newspapers."

"In the meantime Mr. Taft reserves the right to take legal steps, which doubtless have been made more desirable by the events and insinuations of the past 48 hours."

THE WORLD REPEATS.

Declares That President Roosevelt Has Not Told the Truth.

New York, Dec. 9.—The New York World, to which Delavan Smith, editor of the Indianapolis News, referred in his reply to President Roosevelt's attack upon him as the authority for the articles on the Panama canal, which appeared in his paper and called forth the special panel of jurors drawn last week, in view of President Roosevelt's declaration that the money was paid to the French government, says:

FILES! FILES! FILES!

Williams' Indian File Ointment will cure Rins, Bleeding and Itching Piles. It absorbs the tumors, always itching at once, acts as a potent cathartic, relieves the pain, and the Indian File Ointment is prepared for Piles and itching of the private parts. Sold by drug stores and by mail for \$1.00. Williams' Mfg. Co., Prop., Cleveland, Ohio.

Sold by C. H. Kendrick & Co., Barre, Vt.

A Woman's Bank Book

San Chapter Book Book helps a woman's money.

It is a valuable book for every woman. It contains a complete record of all her money, and is a most useful and interesting book. It is sold by all bookstores and by mail for \$1.00.

SARGENT'S GEM FOOD CHOPPER

Chop everything a woman wants chopped, done easily, quickly, neatly, nothing to get out of order, save, keep clean, quickly changed from coarse to fine, useful every day.

The N. D. Phelps Company BARRE

The King of Wheat Foods

Uneeda Biscuit

5¢ In dust tight, moisture proof packages. Never sold in bulk.

NATIONAL BISCUIT COMPANY

liberate mistatement of fact in his scandalous personal attack upon Mr. Delavan Smith, editor of the Indianapolis News.

The World calls upon the Congress of the United States to make immediately a full and impartial investigation of the entire Panama canal scandal.

The investigation of 1906 by the Senate committee of the inter-oceanic canal was blocked by the refusal of William Nelson Cromwell to answer the most pertinent questions of Senator Morgan of Alabama. Since that time nothing has been done because after Senator Morgan's death there was no successor to carry on his great work of revealing the truth about Panama corruption.

"The Indianapolis News said in the editorial for which Mr. Roosevelt assails Mr. Smith:

"It has been charged that the United States bought for American citizens for \$40,000,000 property that cost those citizens only \$12,000,000. There is no doubt that the government paid \$40,000,000 for the property. But who got the money?"

"President Roosevelt's reply to this most proper question is for the most part a string of abusive and defamatory epithets. But he also makes the following statements as truthful information to the American people:

"The United States did not pay a cent of the \$40,000,000 to any American citizen. The government paid this \$40,000,000 direct to the French government, getting the receipt of the liquidator appointed by the French government to receive the same."

"The United States government has not the slightest knowledge as to the particular individuals among whom the French government distributed the same."

"So far as I know, there was no syndicate; there certainly was no syndicate in the United States that to my knowledge had any dealings with the government directly or indirectly."

"To the best of The World's knowledge and belief, each and all of these statements made by Mr. Roosevelt and quoted above are untrue and Mr. Roosevelt must have known they were untrue when he made them."

"As to the detailed distribution of the Panama loot only one man knows it all. That man is William Nelson Cromwell. The two men who were most in Mr. Cromwell's confidence are Theodore Roosevelt, president of the United States, and Elihu Root, former secretary of war and now secretary of state. It was they who aided Mr. Cromwell in consummating the Panama revolution, arranged the terms of the purchase of the Panama canal, made the agreement to pay \$40,000,000 for the canal properties and an additional \$10,000,000 for a manufactured Panama republic, every penny of which was paid by check on the United States treasury to J. P. Morgan & company, not to the French government, as Mr. Roosevelt says, but to J. P. Morgan & company."

"The natural query of the Indianapolis News as to who got the money was based on The World's history summary of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal. The inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

"The French company, organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879, failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate committee on Feb. 26, 1906, 'We never had any connection with the so-called De Lesseps company. Neither did the United States government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama canal company.'

"What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal company, the American Panama Canal company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified in particular of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama canal, the inquiry was originally Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama canal, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relation with the French company, with Panama and with the government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: 'Who got the money?'

company. This company was incorporated in New Jersey with dummy directors. There was also incorporated in New Jersey with dummy directors the inter-oceanic canal.

"Senator Morgan unearthed a copy of the \$5,000,000 syndicate agreement which provided that the subscribers should contract with William Nelson Cromwell to pay in \$5,000,000 in cash and to take their several allotments in the enterprise."

"Five million dollars was more than ample to buy the majority of the other Panama stock. As The World said on Oct. 25:

"Mr. Cromwell applied to the canal situation the methods of American high finance by which a syndicate takes over the property of a bankrupt concern, then creates a holding company and a recapitalization, keeping the majority control, in a syndicate trust."

"Following that, to quote from Mr. Cromwell's testimony, in May, 1904, I, representing the New Panama canal, and Judges Day and Russell, representing Attorney General Knox, consummated the transfer and sale to the United States."

"Mr. Roosevelt says the government paid this \$40,000,000 direct to the French government."

"Mr. Cromwell testified that the United States paid the money to J. P. Morgan & company."

"Mr. Roosevelt says the French government distributed the sum."

"Mr. Cromwell testified as to how he distributed it."

"Mr. Roosevelt talks of 'getting the receipt of the liquidator appointed by the French government to receive the same.'"

"Mr. Cromwell testified: 'Of the \$40,000,000 thus paid by the United States government, \$28,000,000 was paid to the liquidator of the old Panama canal company under and in pursuance of an agreement entered into between the liquidator and the new company.'"

"Of the balance of \$12,000,000 paid to the new Panama Canal company, \$12,000,000 has already been distributed among its stockholders and the remainder is now being held, awaiting final distributions and payment."

"What follows is further eloquent testimony taken by the Senate committee:

"Senator Tallaferro—There is \$3,000,000."

"Mr. Cromwell—Three million, yes, sir."

"Senator Tallaferro—Who holds that money?"

"Mr. Cromwell—The New Panama Canal company in its treasury."

"And yet Mr. Roosevelt says 'The United States government has not the slightest knowledge' as to the distribution of the \$40,000,000 and that 'this was the business of the French government.'"

"As to Mr. Roosevelt's statement that 'there was no syndicate,' he could have read the syndicate subscription agreement on page 1,160, Vol. II, of the testimony before the committee on inter-oceanic canals—if he had cared for the truth."

"That the United States government was not dealing with 'the French government' or with Colombia or with Panama, or with anyone else except William Nelson Cromwell and his associates, is made still more plain by the description of Senator J. Gabriel Duquesne as to the Panama revolution and as to the manner in which Mr. Cromwell got \$10,000,000 additional from the United States government. Senator Duquesne said:

"Mr. Cromwell made the revolution. He offered to make me president of the new republic and to see me through if I would raise a small force of men and declare a secession from Colombia. He made promises that we should have the help of the government—it was accomplished by a liberal use of money. We paid this general and that one, paying \$3,000 to \$5,000 per general. The Colombian officers were all paid off and the revolution was also bought off."

"Then Mr. Cromwell, having been elected by the Panama revolution as general counsel and he and J. Pierpont Morgan having been appointed a 'fiscal commission,' negotiated with President Roosevelt by which the United States paid \$10,000,000 more to the 'fiscal committee' for Mr. Cromwell's Panama republic. Of this money, three-quarters is still under the control of the 'fiscal commission.'"

"Why did the United States pay \$40,000,000 for a bankrupt property whose control could undoubtedly have been purchased in the open market for less than \$4,000,000?"

"Who bought up the obligations of the old Panama Canal company for a few cents on the dollar?"

"Among whom was divided the \$15,000,000 paid to the new Panama Canal company?"

"Whether Douglas Robinson, who is Mr. Roosevelt's brother-in-law, or any of Mr. Taft's brothers associated themselves with Mr. Cromwell in Panama exploitation or shared in these profits is incidental to the main issue of letting in the light."

"Whether they did or did not, whether all the profits went into Mr. Nelson Cromwell's hands or whatever became of them, the fact that Theodore Roosevelt, as president of the United States, issues a public statement about such an important matter full of flagrant untruths, recking with misstatements, challenging line by line the testimony of his associate Cromwell and the official record, makes it imperative that full publicity come at once through the authority and by the action of Congress."

control could undoubtedly have been purchased in the open market for less than \$4,000,000?"

"Who bought up the obligations of the old Panama Canal company for a few cents on the dollar?"

"Among whom was divided the \$15,000,000 paid to the new Panama Canal company?"